

Method of Claim 1.

Group VI: Claim 53, drawn to a phosphorylated protein obtained by the Method of Claim 17.

Group VII: Claim 54, drawn to a method of treating a patient with a Lysosomal hydrolase modified by a GlcNAc phosphotransferase of Claim 26 or 32.

Applicant has elected Group III, Claims 22,26 and ²28-37 with traverse.

Applicant respectfully traverses on the grounds that the Office has not shown that a burden exists in searching the entire application.

Further, MPEP §803 states as follows:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on its merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Applicant submits that a search of all claims would not constitute a serious burden on the Office.

Additionally, MPEP §821.04 states:

...if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Applicant requests that upon finding that the elected group is allowable, the corresponding non-elected process claims be rejoined.

For the reasons set forth above, the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Chinn, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 34,305



22850

Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,518

Tel.: 703-413-3000
Fax: 703-413-3220

RECEIVED

MAR 31 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900